

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

In his Response to Show Cause (Docket No. 28), Attorney Wilson indicates that he has had no communication with Plaintiff since sometime in late 2012, yet he still asks that the Court proceed to rule on the merits of this cause, notwithstanding the fact that Plaintiff, acting *pro se*, asked us to dismiss it. Attorney Wilson submits that it would be a shame, after all the time and energy that the lawyers spent briefing the case, for the Court not to rule, particularly because, in his opinion, Plaintiff has a “legitimate claim.” He speculates that the reason Plaintiff asked the Court to dismiss this case is because she received some bad legal advice from another lawyer.

Without addressing the ethical issues presented by the apparent disagreement between Mr. Wilson and Plaintiff, we find that Plaintiff has very clearly expressed her desire that the case be dismissed (Docket No. 23) and Mr. Wilson has not presented any evidence or legal argument to persuade us that we should ignore the wishes of his client. Accordingly, this case is dismissed with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 03/29/2013

Sarah Evans Barker
SARAH EVANS BARKER, JUDGE
United States District Court
Southern District of Indiana

Copies to:

Thomas E. Kieper
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
tom.kieper@usdoj.gov

Joe Morgan Wilson
ATTORNEY AT LAW
wilsonjoemorgan@bellsouth.net

Monica Mary Sutton
5712 Diana Drive
Indianapolis, IN 46276